

RR



REASON & REVELATION

*A Monthly Journal of Christian Evidences*

JULY 2025 • VOL. 45 • NO. 7

THE **100<sup>th</sup>**  
ANNIVERSARY OF  
THE **Scopes**  
**"Monkey"**  
TRIAL



**AP** Staff Spotlight

# 100 YEARS LATER:

## Revisiting the Scopes "Monkey" Trial

Eric Lyons

ONE hundred years ago this month, all eyes and ears were on Dayton, Tennessee—a little town in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains with a population of fewer than 2,000. Some 200 reporters from as far away as Chicago, Baltimore, and even London converged upon Dayton in the scorching summer of 1925 to cover the Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes Trial. More popularly called “The Scopes Monkey Trial,” it was the first court case ever to be broadcast live on the radio.

### BACKGROUND

WHAT precipitated such an unprecedented court case? Why all the hysteria? In the 1920s, several state legislatures in the U.S. were contemplating banning some form of the Theory of Evolution from being taught in public schools. On March 21, 1925, Tennessee Governor Austin Peay signed into law the Butler Act, which was first introduced by Representative John Washington Butler two months earlier and was the first of its kind in the country. Specifically, the Butler Act stated:

That it shall be unlawful for any teacher in any of the universities, normals<sup>1</sup> and all other public schools of the State which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the

state, to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.<sup>2</sup>

When the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) learned of the passing of the Butler Act, they quickly began soliciting in newspapers for a willing Tennessee participant in hopes of testing the veracity of the Butler Act. The ACLU wanted to represent a science teacher who had taught evolution since the Butler Act became law in Tennessee. However, the teacher they ultimately represented was *far* from the ideal candidate and one of the first signs that the “Scopes” Trial should never have happened.

### The Unprincipled Selection of Scopes

John Scopes was a first-year math and physics teacher and football coach at Rhea County High School in Dayton, Tennessee in 1924-25. He was *not* the school’s biology teacher. But Scopes did substitute for the regular biology teacher (Principal William Ferguson) for two weeks in April 1925 using the previously approved textbook *A Civic Biology*, which indeed contained material on human evolution.<sup>3</sup>

How did Scopes become the defendant in (what many have called) “the trial of the century”?

Did one or more of his students accuse him of breaking the Butler Act? Was there a parent, school administrator, or a group of vile Christians out to get Scopes (as the terribly historically inaccurate 1960 movie *Inherit the Wind* vividly portrayed)?<sup>4</sup> Not at all.

The school term was already over, and Scopes was enjoying some leisure time at the tennis courts in Dayton when a few leading community members summoned him to the local drugstore. They weren’t looking to tar and feather Scopes but rather to use him as a pawn in their plan to bring some excitement and commerce to their little town. They were hoping that he *had* taught human evolution so that they could contact the ACLU about representing Scopes in a trial in Dayton because “such a case would put Dayton on the map and benefit business.”<sup>5</sup>

Scopes admitted, “I had been tapped and trapped by the rush of events.” This young man, with only one year of teaching experience under his belt, agreed to stand trial, saying, “If you can prove that I’ve taught evolution, and that I can qualify as a defendant, then I’ll be willing to stand trial.” If? What did he mean, “If”? Scopes admitted in his memoirs, “To tell the truth, I *wasn’t sure I had taught evolution*.” But the townsmen “weren’t concerned about this technicality.”<sup>6</sup>

Scopes had “expressed willingness to stand trial. That was enough.” The owner of the drugstore proceeded to call the *Chattanooga News*: “This is F.E. Robinson in Dayton,” he said. “I’m chairman of the school board here. We’ve just arrested a man for teaching evolution.” And what was Scopes’ reaction to being “arrested”? He said: “I drank the fountain drink that had been handed me and I went back to the high school to finish playing tennis with the kids....



[T]hey [Robinson and the other men] would handle the technicalities of my 'arrest' and bond."<sup>7</sup> The next day, the *Chattanooga News* announced Scopes' "arrest," which was then picked up by the Associated Press, which then became a national story. Apparently, so unusual were the circumstances surrounding Scopes' original "arrest" and subsequent indictment that when the Court initially convened for his actual trial in July, Tennessee's Attorney General Tom Stewart suggested, "[I]n this case, we think a new indictment be returned.... [B]oth sides are anxious that the record be kept straight and regular...."<sup>8</sup>

### Legendary Lawyers

As if the selection of Scopes as the defendant in this trial was not bizarre enough, the leading prosecutor selected was a three-time presidential candidate and former Secretary of State *who had not tried a case in more than 30 years*. William Jennings Bryan was a very intelligent, talented, articulate individual,<sup>9</sup> but his selection as prosecuting attorney may have had more to do with his *fame* than an overall commitment to facts. Dayton lawyer Sue Hicks,<sup>10</sup> who "just happened" to be present at Robinson's drugstore the day of Scopes' "arrest," no doubt called upon Bryan (a Miami, Florida resident at the time) to serve on the prosecution team, *in part* because of his well-known advocacy for anti-evolution legislation, but also for his sheer iconic status, which would do exactly what the leading townsmen desired—"put Dayton on the map and benefit business."<sup>11</sup>

Upon learning that the legendary William Jennings Bryan was selected to prosecute Scopes, nationally known agnostic and trial lawyer Clarence Darrow convinced the ACLU (of which he was a member) to allow him to join the defense team as lead defender. Darrow was

a fierce critic of the Bible and Christianity.<sup>12</sup> During the Scopes Trial, Darrow referred to Bryan's Bible-believing, Christian religion as "fool religion."<sup>13</sup> And in his essay, "Why I Am An Agnostic," Darrow made his thoughts about God and the Bible crystal clear: "The fear of God is not the beginning of wisdom. The fear of God is the death of wisdom."<sup>14</sup> Bryan referred to Darrow as "the greatest atheist or agnostic in the United States."<sup>15</sup>

### A Court Case or a Publicity Stunt?

In one sense, the Scopes Trial was cut and dry (or at least it should have been): Had John Scopes violated Tennessee law (i.e., the Butler Act)? This was the central question. Judge John T. Raulston instructed the Grand Jury on the first day of proceedings, saying:

Gentlemen of the grand jury, on May 25, 1925, John T. Scopes was indicted in this county for violating what is generally known as the anti-evolution statute.... [T]he vital question now involved for your consideration is, has the statute been violated by the said John T. Scopes or any other person by teaching a theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and in Rhea County since the passage of this act and prior to this investigation. If you find the statute has been thus violated, you should indict the guilty person

or persons, as the case may be. *You will bear in mind that in this investigation you are not interested to inquire into the policy or wisdom of this legislation.*<sup>16</sup>

Throughout the trial, Judge Raulston similarly stated:

It is not within the province of the court under these issues to decide and determine which is true, the story of divine creation as taught in the Bible, or the story of the creation of man as taught by evolution.... [T]his court is not further concerned as to its policy, but is interested only in its proper interpretation and, if valid, its enforcement.... The question is whether or not Mr. Scopes taught men descended from the lower order of animals.<sup>17</sup>

Though technically Scopes was on trial, in reality, the defense, prosecution, and media made sure that it was more of a theatrical stage to banter about freedom and "fundamentalism,"<sup>18</sup> the Bible and evolution, secularism and Christianity. How often does a defense attorney—whose client did not plead guilty at the beginning of the trial—argue a case for seven days and then abruptly conclude (as Darrow did), "I think to save time we will ask the court to bring in the jury and instruct the jury to find the defendant guilty. We make no objection to that and it will save a lot of time and I think that should be done."<sup>19</sup> In what reasonable trial

**Reason & Revelation** is published monthly by Apologetics Press, Inc. Periodicals postage paid at Montgomery, AL. **Postmaster:** Send address changes to **Reason & Revelation**, 230 Landmark Dr., Montgomery, AL 36117; **ISSN:**[1542-0922] **USPS#** 023415.

**Apologetics Press** is a non-profit, tax-exempt work dedicated to the defense of New Testament Christianity. Copyright © 2025. All rights reserved.

#### Editor & Associate Editor:

Eric Lyons, M.Min.  
Jeff Miller, M.S., Ph.D.\*  
(\*Biomechanical Engineering, Auburn University)

#### Annual Subscription Rates:

|         |                                                 |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------|
| \$14.00 | Domestic & Overseas<br>(OVERSEAS: ADD SHIPPING) |
| \$12.00 | Domestic Bulk<br>(5+ TO SAME ADDRESS)           |

#### Orders, Inquiries, & Address Changes:

|         |                            |
|---------|----------------------------|
| Phone:  | (334) 272-8558             |
| Web:    | store.apologeticspress.org |
| E-mail: | mail@apologeticspress.org  |

**Discovery—Scripture & Science for Kids** is a sister publication for children. For more information, please contact our offices or visit the Discovery website at: [www.DiscoveryMagazine.org](http://www.DiscoveryMagazine.org)

does the defense (a) call the prosecuting attorney to take the stand and be cross-examined, (b) admit that the prosecuting attorney (Bryan in this case) would not be very valuable as a witness (in terms of what the trial was originally about), and (c) agree that they themselves may be cross-examined, but then never give the prosecution the opportunity to do so because the defense suddenly tells the jury and judge to find their client guilty, and the trial quickly comes to an end with no closing arguments?<sup>20</sup>

Prosecuting attorney Bryan seemed strangely eager to take the stand as an expert witness on the Bible. When asked, “Mr. Bryan, you are not objecting to going on the stand?” his response was, “Not at all.”<sup>21</sup> Perhaps Bryan sincerely wanted to try to “give a defense” of the Bible and of the freedom of Tennesseans to teach creation to the exclusion of evolution? Maybe he was mostly motivated by the genuine expectation of cross-examining Darrow and the other defense lawyers?<sup>22</sup> Perhaps Bryan allowed pride to get the best of him? Or maybe it was a combination of all three?

Though at one point in the trial the bailiff declared, “People, this is no circus. There are no monkeys up here,”<sup>23</sup> the Scopes Trial might accurately be described as more spectacle than substance. (A case could be made that it was more unusual and bizarre than the infamous O.J. Simpson trial 70 years later.) *The New York Times* reported before the trial ever began that an actress offered “the use of a trained chimpanzee to combat the law” (i.e., the Butler Act).<sup>24</sup> Renowned radio announcer Quinn Ryan, from WGN Chicago, “famous for creating broadcasts that were ‘almost as good as being there,’” comically portrayed Bryan’s entrance into the courtroom as if he was a heavyweight boxer,

saying, “Here comes William Jennings Bryan. He enters now. His bald pate like a sunrise over Key West.”<sup>25</sup> What’s more, while *inside* the court, Darrow was cited for “contempt and insult,”<sup>26</sup> blatantly insulting the judge’s integrity multiple times in one day;<sup>27</sup> one writer described the scene *outside* the courthouse (even as the trial was just getting started), as “half circus and half a revival meeting.”<sup>28</sup>

### Much Bigger Than Scopes

While in one sense, the Scopes Trial was simply about a statute violation, in reality, it was about something much bigger: a battle between ideas of human origins and what should be taught in public schools. Did humans evolve from animals (as Darrow passionately believed), or are we the descendants of an original man and woman supernaturally created by God, to Whom we are accountable (as Bryan was convinced is true and literally taught in the Bible)?

At various times in the proceedings, both sides referred to the anticipated future trial in an appellate court, which was expected to focus on the constitutionality of the Butler Act.<sup>29</sup> In fact, Darrow indicated during the Scopes Trial that going to a higher court was his only purpose, saying, “What we are interested in, counsel well knows what the judgment and verdict in this case will be. *We have a right to present our case to another court and that is all we are after.*”<sup>30</sup> In his 1932 autobiography, Darrow went further in stating what his purpose had been in the Scopes Trial:

My object, and *my only object*, was to focus the attention of the country on the programme of Mr. Bryan and the other fundamentalists in America. I knew that education was in danger from the source that has always hampered it—religious fanaticism. To me it

was perfectly clear that the proceedings bore little semblance to a court case, but I realized that there was no limit to the mischief that might be accomplished unless the country was roused to the evil at hand. So I volunteered to go.<sup>31</sup>

### ALLEGED PROOFS OF EVOLUTION IN THE SCOPES TRIAL

**S**INCE the Scopes Trial was technically about whether John Scopes had violated the Butler Act—and not about the legitimacy of the law itself—Judge Raulston was “not interested to inquire into the policy or wisdom of this legislation.”<sup>32</sup> Thus, the judge ruled that testimony from evolutionary scientists was not germane to Scopes’ innocence or guilt and thus inadmissible evidence for the jury to consider. However, the judge did allow “expert testimony” (in the form of affidavits) to be read into the trial records (making up about 20% of the overall transcript of the trial) for the benefit of the appellate court in the event Scopes was found guilty and the defense appealed the case.<sup>33</sup>

So, what proof of evolution did the “experts” give that “religious fanatics” and “fundamentalist Christians” like William Jennings Bryan missed, willfully ignored, or outright rejected in 1925? Was the creationist’s dismissal of evolution (and especially human evolution, as stated in the Butler Act) inconsistent with the available facts? Should there be, as Darrow claimed during the trial, “no question among intelligent men about *the fact of evolution*”?<sup>34</sup>

### Comparative Anatomy

The terms “similar,” “homology,” and “comparative anatomy”<sup>35</sup> occur some *60 times* in the testimony of the expert evolutionists filed into the official Scopes Trial record



on day seven of the proceedings. Known as “homology,” the comparison of similar body structures of various living organisms allegedly proves evolution. Since, for example, the flipper of a whale, the wing of a bat, the forefoot of a dog, and the human arm and hand have certain similarities, supposedly they share the same ancestor from many millions of years ago. According to this line of argumentation, the first humans were not specially designed by the Creator, but evolved from animal ancestors.

Creationists rationally and unashamedly acknowledge the many similarities that exist among the various kinds of animal life on Earth, and even between animals and humans. (Millions of living things have eyes, ears, mouths, digestive systems, respiratory systems, etc.) In truth, similarities among living things fit perfectly with the Creation viewpoint. Such similarities should be expected among creatures *designed* to breathe the same air, drink the same water, eat the same food, live on the same land, and generally use the same five senses to function in our physical world. *But homology neither proves creation nor evolution.* Similar structures are just a fact. When evolutionists (like those in the Scopes Trial) contend that homology is evidence of evolution, they are *not* stating a fact but are making an *unproven (and unprovable) assertion*.<sup>36</sup>

### Embryonic Recapitulation

The terms “embryo” or “embryonic development”<sup>37</sup> appear 40 times in the expert evolutionists’ written testimony in the Scopes Trial. According to these men, “the facts of comparative embryology” are powerful evidence of evolution<sup>38</sup> and had been recognized by evolutionists such as Ernst Haeckel for decades. Haeckel, for example, “believed that organisms retrace

their evolution as embryos, when they ‘climb their own family tree.’”<sup>39</sup> One evolutionary zoologist in the Scopes trial alleged:

In many instances certain early stages in the development of an advanced organism resemble in unmistakable ways the end stages of less advanced organisms. There is, in fact, in the long ontogeny of members of high groups, a sort of rough-and-ready repetition of the characteristic features of many lower groups. This fact has so impressed some biologists that they have embodied it into a law, the so-called biogenetic law: that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny. In less technical language this means that the various stages in the development of the individual are like the various ancestral forms from which the species is descended, the earliest embryonic stages being like the most remote ancestors and the latter stages like the more recent ancestors. In still other words, the concept may be stated as follows: The developmental history of the individual may be regarded as an abbreviated resume of its ancestral history.<sup>40</sup>

Supposedly, the human embryo goes through evolutionary stages of growth—through a kind of “fish stage,” “salamander stage,” and even an animal-like tail stage. One evolutionary anthropologist in the Scopes Trial stated: “Going to the human embryo we find these vestiges of an earlier condition much more developed while others appear for a time and then vanish before birth. *Such a case is the free tail possessed by every human embryo, a few weeks before its birth.*”<sup>41</sup>

Interestingly, more than a decade prior to the Scopes Trial, prominent British evolutionary anatomist and physician Sir Arthur Keith, admitted in his book *The Human Body*, “It was *expected* that the embryo would recapitulate [retrace—EL] the features of its ancestors from

the lowest to the highest forms in the animal kingdom. *Now that the appearances of the embryo at all ages are known, the general feeling is one of disappointment; the human embryo at no stage is anthropoid in its appearance.* The truth is, we expected too much.”<sup>42</sup>

And what have we learned in the last century? Renowned evolutionist Stephen J. Gould wrote in 2000 in *Natural History* magazine:

Haeckel remains most famous today as the chief architect and *propagandist* for a famous argument that science disproved long ago but that popular culture has never fully abandoned.... Once ensconced in textbooks, misleading information becomes cocooned and effectively permanent, because...textbooks copy from previous texts.... We should therefore not be surprised that Haeckel’s drawings entered nineteenth-century textbooks. But we do, I think, have the right to be both astonished and ashamed by *the century of mindless recycling* that has led to the persistence of these drawings in a large number, if not majority, of modern textbooks.<sup>43</sup>

The so-called biogenetic law (of embryonic recapitulation), which played such a prominent part in the written evolutionists’ testimony in the Scopes Trial, was and is a farce.<sup>44</sup>

### Vestigial Organs

Two sections in the expert evolutionists’ written testimony dealt with vestigial organs<sup>45</sup>—the idea that animals and humans have previously functional, but now leftover, useless structures of evolution. Allegedly:

There are, according to Wiedersheim, no less than 180 vestigial structures in the human body,<sup>46</sup> sufficient to make of a man a veritable walking museum of antiquities. Among these are the vermiform appendix, the abbreviated tail with its set of caudal

muscles.... These and numerous other structures of the same sort can be reasonably interpreted as evidence that man has descended from ancestors in which these organs were functional. Man has never completely lost these characters; he continues to inherit them *though he no longer has any use for them*.<sup>47</sup>

Another Scopes Trial evolutionist alleged: “*Man has a vestigial tail* [i.e., the coccyx—EL] composed generally of about four vertebrae so small and so short as to be entirely concealed in the flesh and muscles at the base of the spine.”<sup>48</sup>

What is the truth of the matter? Once again, the “experts” in the Scopes Trial got it wrong—very wrong! The more that doctors have learned about the human body, the more they have recognized *legitimate functions* of the so-called “vestigial organs.” The appendix serves an “immunological function...in the developing embryo” and “continues to function even in the adult.”<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, the appendix “acts like a bacteria factory, cultivating the good germs,”<sup>50</sup> serving as “a reservoir of good gut bacteria.”<sup>51</sup> And the human coccyx is extremely important. It serves as a point of attachment for several pelvic muscles that help us stand up. And, like the shocks on a car, the coccyx is also used as a shock absorber when we sit down.<sup>52</sup> Although the evolutionary experts in 1925 confidently asserted, “All of the lines of evidence presented point strongly to organic evolution, and *none* are contrary to this principle,”<sup>53</sup> real, observable, rational, operational science has proved them very wrong.

What’s more, while “vestigial” organs are not the useless organs that many have made them out to be, suppose (*for the sake of argument*) that scientists did discover one or more organs in the human body that had a reduced function—

or no function at all? What if the particular organ functioned perfectly in the past but not so much today? Would this actually be evidence of evolution? Not at all. The human body is a marvelous thing to study and shows amazing, complex, functional design—which logically demands a Designer (and not accidental evolution over many millions of years). However, since the first humans were on Earth, much degeneration has taken place. Many diseases and mutations have been introduced into the human gene pool. Is it possible that there could be a loss of a gene for an organ at some point, which causes the organ not to function as well as it once did—or perhaps lose function altogether one day? If so, then even if it were ever proven that a “vestigial organ” exists, *such an organ would not logically prove evolution to be true*. In fact, wouldn’t the presence of “vestigial organs” actually be evidence of “devolution,” not “evolution,” with organisms being more complex the farther back in time we go?<sup>54</sup>

Once again, the “evolution-is-a-fact” hype surrounding the Scopes Trial was anything but factual.<sup>55</sup> The more we continue to learn, the more erroneous and inadequate the impotent theory of evolution is demonstrated to be. Millions of people may still believe it, but they do so more out of a religious commitment to blind faith, rather than because the evidence demands such a verdict.

### Alleged Human Evolution

The evolutionary scientists in the Scopes Trial also had much to say about “evidence” for human evolution, but as with all the other “proofs” they offered, their “evidence” was either irrelevant, deficient,<sup>56</sup> or (eventually) disproven altogether. “The dawn man of Piltdown”<sup>57</sup> (i.e., Piltdown Man) was determined to

be a forgery in 1953. (Someone had combined the skull of a human and the jawbone of an ape.) The “Java ape-man,” as one Scopes Trial scientist called him,<sup>58</sup> was “erroneously based on the skull cap of a gibbon and fossilized teeth and thigh bone of a modern human.”<sup>59</sup> It was not some kind of missing link! What’s more, “Rhodesian man,” “Heidelberg man,” and “Neanderthal man” (all of which were brought up multiple times by the Scopes Trial evolutionists in their affidavits) were nothing more than varieties of past humans.<sup>60</sup> (And if we look around the planet today, there is still a great amount of observable variety within humankind. Such diversity should also be expected from the fossil record: human bones of various shapes and sizes.)

### Human Evolution’s Racist Implications

Though the Scopes Trial expert evolutionists may not have been racist in their affidavits, the textbook that Scopes used (or allegedly used) to teach evolutionary theory included racist language. Under consecutive sections titled “Evolution of Man” and “The Races of Man,” Scopes’ textbook taught impressionable minds the following:

Undoubtedly there once lived upon the earth races of men who were much lower in their mental organization than the present inhabitants. If we follow the early history of man upon the earth, we find that at first he must have been little better than one of the lower animals.... The beginnings of civilization were long ago, but even to-day the earth is not entirely civilized.... At the present time there exist upon the earth five races or varieties of man, each very different from the other in instincts, social customs, and, to an extent, in structure. These are the Ethiopian or negro type, originating in Africa; the Malay or brown race, from the islands of the Pacific;



# APOLOGETICS PRESS WEBSITE AND WEB STORE

## AP WEBSITE

- Free digital journals, books, audio, and video
- Thousands of articles
- Hundreds of videos and audio lessons

## AP WEB STORE

- VBS
- Dozens of books
- Bibles
- & more



SCAN the QR  
code to view  
AP's Web Store  
or go to  
[STORE.APOLOGETICSPRESS.ORG](http://STORE.APOLOGETICSPRESS.ORG)



SCAN the QR code to view  
AP's Website or go to  
[APOLOGETICSPRESS.ORG](http://APOLOGETICSPRESS.ORG)

the American Indian; the Mongolian or yellow race, including the natives of China, Japan, and the Eskimos; and finally, the highest type of all, the Caucasians, represented by the civilized white inhabitants of Europe and America.<sup>61</sup>

Where would such racist ideas of white supremacy originate? Not from the Bible, not from the Creator and Christ, and not from pure Christianity, Whose Author and Namesake taught that *everyone* is created in the image of God and has a priceless immortal soul, which Jesus loves so much that He gave His life to save. The arrogant, destructive, repulsive teachings of Scopes' textbook are the detestable logical effects of naturalistic evolutionary ideas, including the evolutionists' beloved hero, Charles Darwin, who was mentioned more than 20 times in the trial by Scopes' defense lawyers and expert evolutionists. What's more, Darwin's book *The Origin of Species* was referred to in the trial as "one of the epoch-making books of all time."<sup>62</sup> Readers would do well to acquaint themselves with the full title of Darwin's book: *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection—or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.

The fact is, Darwinian evolution, so fiercely defended in the Scopes Trial, implies that some groups of humans are closer to our alleged ape-like ancestors in their mental faculties than others. Thus, some groups of humans are supposedly superior to others. The Bible teaches exactly the opposite. There are not different species or races of men; there is just one human race—an intelligent people—that God created "in His image" in the beginning (Genesis 1-2), both "male and female" (Genesis 1:27). According to the Bible, all of humanity descended from Adam and Eve, the first couple (1 Corinthi-

ans 15:45; Genesis 3:20), and later Noah, through whom the Earth was repopulated after the Flood (Genesis 6-10). Whatever the shades of our skin, whatever the shapes of our bodies, we share equal value as human beings (Genesis 1:26-28; cf. Romans 10:12)—but not according to Darwinian evolution and Scopes' biology textbook.

## THE BIBLE ON TRIAL

**T**HE climax of the eight-day Scopes Trial came near the end—at the latter part of day seven. Following the defense's lengthy submission of expert evolutionary testimony, they abruptly called to the stand to testify, of all people, the world-famous prosecuting attorney and three-time presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan.<sup>63</sup> "[E]ven if your honor thinks it is not admissible in general, so we wish to call him now," said defense attorney Hayes.<sup>64</sup> Against the other prosecuting attorneys' better judgment,<sup>65</sup> Bryan seemed eager to take the stand (though admittedly, from the beginning of his questioning and throughout, both Judge Raulston and the defense attorneys led Bryan to believe that he would have equal opportunity to put Darrow and the others on the stand).<sup>66</sup> [Had Bryan known that he would actually never have an opportunity to question Darrow or the others, he may not have chosen to testify.]<sup>67</sup>

So, what happened during Darrow's one-sided interrogation of Bryan? In short, the renowned agnostic tried to humiliate Bryan and discredit his literal interpretation of various biblical miracles, including (1) God creating Eve from Adam's rib, (2) the Genesis Flood, (3) the extraordinarily long day during the time of Joshua,<sup>68</sup> and (4) Jonah surviving for three days inside of a large sea creature.

Admittedly, if no supernatural God exists, then (a) the miracles of the Bible are make-believe, (b) the Bible itself is merely a work of fiction, and (c) Bible-believing Christians are very naïve (just as Darrow wanted the world to believe in 1925). *However*, if an omniscient, omnipotent, supernatural Being does exist,<sup>69</sup> then He could work any number of supernatural miracles (which are in harmony with His divine will).

- If there were no Universe, and He chose to create one, He could simply speak it into existence (Psalm 33:6-9).
- If He wanted to miraculously create a grown man from the dust of the ground and a mature woman from the man's rib,<sup>70</sup> such a feat would seem quite simple for God after everything else He had previously made during the creation week.
- If the same God Who made light, as well as mornings and evenings on Earth without a Sun on days 1-3 of creation (Genesis 1:3-19),<sup>71</sup> chose to make the Sun and Moon in Joshua's day to "stand still" (at least in some sense), such an act by the Creator of the Universe would be simple—whether we understand exactly how He did it or not. (And we don't!) Is it possible for the omnipotent Creator, Whom the Bible says currently "upholds the Universe by the word of His power" (Hebrews 1:3, ESV), to miraculously manipulate a day on Earth to His liking? Is it possible for God to perhaps refract light or to specially create some kind of light to illuminate a part of the Earth for a longer period of time than the normal daylight hours? Though skeptics (whether in 1925 or 2025) often ridicule the idea of miracles, in truth, if a supernatural God exists, then supernatural miracles are possible—including an astronomical miracle on behalf



of the Israelites when they faced the armies of the Amorites.

- If the Creator of everything on Earth chose to (1) prepare “a great fish to swallow Jonah,” (2) keep Jonah safe inside the sea creature for three days, and then (3) speak to the fish to have it vomit Jonah onto dry land, an all-powerful God could do exactly that.
- And if there were no written revelation from the Creator to humankind, He could certainly make that happen (cf. 2 Peter 1:20-21). He could ensure that writers of His choosing penned what He wanted humanity to know. If He wanted mankind to know that He created the world and everything in it, He could tell them through His divinely inspired writers. If He wanted His human creation to know about some of the miracles He worked through the millennia, again, He could communicate such information through His chosen writers.

In reality, the highly irrational position is Darrow’s atheistic (or agnostic) evolution. Naturalistic atheism contends that matter came from nothing, life came from non-life, intelligence came from non-intelligence, and complex, functional design (like that found in everything from a honeybee to the human brain) had no designer. Such commitment to naturalism is a blind faith.<sup>72</sup> Yet it’s “fundamentalist Christians” who are portrayed as irrational<sup>73</sup>—for believing that a supernatural God could create a “whale” (or some type of sea creature)<sup>74</sup> that could swallow Jonah. Have we forgotten that evolutionists contend that non-fish evolved into fish, some of which left the water to become dog-like creatures, and some of those dog-like creatures eventually went back into the oceans to evolve flukes, baleen, blowholes, and much more—on

their way to becoming gigantic whales? This is the only “factual” story about whales that children can hear in school today, despite (1) no real evidence (only imaginative interpretations of various fossils), and (2) the law of biogenesis, which observably indicates that life reproduces after its *own* kind<sup>75</sup> (i.e., fish do not become land animals and land animals do not become fish or whales).

### EIGHT TAKEAWAYS FROM THE SCOPES TRIAL

1. Always look to the source material for the real story. The propaganda machine was hard at work in 1925, just as it is today. We should not simply read what an evolutionist or a creationist says about a matter. Examine the *actual evidence* for yourself and come to honest, informed, logical conclusions, whether about the Scopes Trial, the Bible, or anything else—but especially about eternally important matters!
2. Neither Scopes’ lawyers nor their “expert” evolutionists proved evolution to be true. Everything they testified about evolution was erroneous, irrelevant, or very inadequate.<sup>76</sup>
3. Darrow neither disproved the Bible nor any miracle of the Bible; he merely mocked it and those who believed the evidence for its Divine inspiration and reliability.<sup>77</sup>
4. Though Christian-minded Tennessee lawmakers undoubtedly meant well in 1925 when passing the “anti-evolution” Butler Act, attempting to *legislate* various Bible teachings is probably not the wisest course of action. After all, how has that worked out for Christians when they find themselves in the minority in the U.S. and elsewhere around the world, in this century or some other?<sup>78</sup> Perhaps the best course of action is to kindly encourage “free and just” legislation that allows for and promotes robust study and open, honest debate in schools and society at large.
5. Christians should continually pray for strength and prepare themselves to endure mocking and misrepresentations from anyone, including media propaganda. Just as Bryan and “fundamentalist Christians” were mocked in 1925, and just as Jesus was unjustly scorned and misrepresented 2,000

## SPEAKING SCHEDULES

### Kyle Butt

|            |                 |                |
|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| July 9     | Mt. Juliet, TN  | (615) 758-2274 |
| July 10-12 | Paintsville, KY | (606) 789-6219 |
| July 16-18 | Branson, MO     | (877) 338-3397 |

### Eric Lyons

|            |             |                |
|------------|-------------|----------------|
| July 13-14 | Dunlap, TN  | (423) 554-4431 |
| July 17-19 | Branson, MO | (877) 338-3397 |

### Dave Miller

|         |                |                |
|---------|----------------|----------------|
| July 1  | Southaven, MS  | (662) 874-5508 |
| July 23 | Crossville, TN | (931) 484-5297 |

### Jeff Miller

|              |                 |                |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| August 8-10  | Glenwood, AR    | (870) 356-3543 |
| August 15-21 | Sevierville, TN | (877) 338-3397 |

- years ago, Christians will (at least occasionally) be unfairly persecuted (Matthew 5:10-12; 1 Peter 4:14-16).
6. Regardless of how disrespectful others may be when talking about God, the Bible, Jesus, or Christians, “[l]et your speech always be with grace, seasoned with salt” (Colossians 4:6). Give honest, reasonable answers to questions *in a spirit of “gentleness and respect”* (1 Peter 3:15, ESV). Drastically different than the way *Inherit the Wind* (1960) portrayed Tennessee Christians’ hateful treatment of Darrow, in truth, the agnostic admitted near the end of the trial just how well he had been treated: “[S]o far as the people of Tennessee are concerned...I don’t know as I was ever in a community in my life where my religious ideas differed as widely from the great mass as I have found them since I have been in Tennessee. Yet I came here a perfect stranger and I can say what I have said before that I have not found upon anybody’s part—any citizen here in this town or outside, the slightest discourtesy. I have been treated better, kindlier and more hospitably than I fancied would have been the case in the north, and that is due largely to the ideas that southern people have and they are, perhaps, more hospitable than we are up north.”<sup>79</sup>
7. Christians must balance being courageous with being wise. Bryan may have appeared to bravely take the stand in the Scopes Trial, but it was a foolish move on that occasion (and not because the Bible cannot be logically defended).<sup>80</sup> Jesus wants Christians to be courageous (Matthew 10:27-28), but He also taught His followers to “not give what is holy to the dogs; nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you in pieces” (Matthew 7:6). Or as the wise man said: “Do not answer a fool according to his folly, lest you also be like him” (Proverbs 26:4).

8. Anyone who is interested in more information on the Scopes Trial should read Bryan’s closing argument,<sup>81</sup> which he was not allowed to deliver due to the trial’s unusual ending. Though imperfect, Bryan makes several fundamental points for both creationists and evolutionists to seriously consider, most notably regarding morality and the afterlife.

## CONCLUSION

**T**HE Scopes Trial was more than a legal showdown—it was a cultural clash revealing a deep divide between naturalistic and theistic worldviews, one that still exists today. Though a century has passed, the lessons remain relevant: truth matters, civility counts, and genuine Christian faith requires both courage and discernment. Let us learn from history—not to mindlessly relive battles fought in 1925, but to be honest, think clearly, stand faithfully, and speak graciously as we have opportunity to do good in 2025.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Schools that trained teachers.
- <sup>2</sup> Butler Act (1925), Tennessee Virtual Archive, [teva.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/scopes/id/166](http://teva.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/scopes/id/166).
- <sup>3</sup> George W. Hunter (1914), *A Civic Biology* (New York: American Book Company), [librarycollections.law.umn.edu/documents/darrow/Hunter\\_Civic\\_Biology\\_1914.pdf](http://librarycollections.law.umn.edu/documents/darrow/Hunter_Civic_Biology_1914.pdf), pp. 194-196.
- <sup>4</sup> The witch hunt, jailing, and burning in effigy of Scopes’ character portrayed in the award-winning 1960 movie *Inherit the Wind* is far from reality; **it is a gross mischaracterization of the facts of history** that seemingly few people know. Sadly, impressionable students in countless classrooms around the U.S. watch this classic. Like the General Theory of Evolution, the facts are not on the side of *Inherit the Wind*, yet most students will not hear the real story about the Scopes Trial.
- <sup>5</sup> John T. Scopes and James Presley (1967), *Center of the Storm: Memoirs of John T. Scopes* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston), p. 61.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61, emp. added.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.
- <sup>8</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript in *The World’s Most Famous Court Trial: Tennessee Evolution Case* (1990), (Dayton, TN: Bryan College), p. 4. NOTE: The first 319 pages of this book are a “word-for-word report” of the Scopes Trial.
- <sup>9</sup> Regardless of how historically inaccurate

the movie *Inherit the Wind* portrayed his character.

- <sup>10</sup> Apparently the same “Sue” whom Johnny Cash sang about in “A Boy Named Sue.”
- <sup>11</sup> Scopes and Presley, p. 61.
- <sup>12</sup> Clarence Darrow (no date), *Absurdities of the Bible* (Girard, KS: Haldeman-Julius Publications); see also Clarence Darrow (1929), *Why I Am an Agnostic* (Girard, KS: Haldeman-Julius), pp. 27-40, [librarycollections.law.umn.edu/documents/darrow/why\\_I\\_am\\_an\\_agnostic.pdf](http://librarycollections.law.umn.edu/documents/darrow/why_I_am_an_agnostic.pdf). See also Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 99.
- <sup>13</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 288.
- <sup>14</sup> Darrow (1929), p. 40.
- <sup>15</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 299.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 6, emp. added.
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 202, 284.
- <sup>18</sup> By “fundamentalism,” Clarence Darrow, in essence, is referring to Christians who interpreted such things as the biblical creation account, Flood account, etc., literally rather than figuratively.
- <sup>19</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 306.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 284.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 282.
- <sup>24</sup> “Evolution Stirs Heat in Dayton, Tennessee; Citizens Protest Sharing Trial Publicity with Chattanooga—Meeting Ends in Fist Fight” (1925), *The New York Times*, May 20, [www.nytimes.com/1925/05/20/archives/evolution-stirs-heat-in-dayton-tennessee-citizens-protest-sharing.html](http://www.nytimes.com/1925/05/20/archives/evolution-stirs-heat-in-dayton-tennessee-citizens-protest-sharing.html).
- <sup>25</sup> “WGN Broadcasts the Trial,” [www.pbs.org/wgbh/americalexperience/features/monkeytrial-wgn-radio-broadcasts-trial/](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americalexperience/features/monkeytrial-wgn-radio-broadcasts-trial/).
- <sup>26</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 211.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 206-207.
- <sup>28</sup> “Dayton Keyed Up for Opening Today of Trial of Scopes” (1925), *The New York Times*, July 10, <https://www.nytimes.com/1925/07/10/archives/dayton-keyed-up-for-opening-today-of-trial-of-scopes-intense.html>.
- <sup>29</sup> In reality, the Tennessee Supreme court overturned Scopes’ conviction on a technicality. “Under section 14 of article 6 of the Constitution of Tennessee, a fine in excess of \$50 must be assessed by a jury.... Since the jury alone can impose the penalty this Act requires, and as a matter of course no different penalty can be inflicted, the trial judge exceeded his jurisdiction in levying this fine [of \$100—EL], and we are without power to correct his error. The judgment must accordingly be reversed.... The Court is informed that the plaintiff in error is no longer in the service of the State. We see nothing to be gained by prolonging the life of this bizarre case” [“John Thomas Scopes v the State, Appeal from the Criminal Court of Rhea County” (1927), Supreme Court of Tennessee, January 17, <https://famous-trials.com/scopesmonkey/2087-appealdecision>].
- <sup>30</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 206, emp. added.
- <sup>31</sup> Clarence Darrow (1932), *The Story of My Life* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons), p. 249, emp. added, [gutenberg.net.au/ebooks05/0500951h.html](http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks05/0500951h.html).
- <sup>32</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, pp. 6, 202. Even on day seven of the trial, Judge Raulston reminded the defense, “The question is whether or not



- Mr. Scopes taught men descended from the lower order of animals" (p. 284).
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., pp. 201-280. One scientist (Dr. Maynard Metcalf) was allowed to give testimony in person, though without the jury's presence (pp. 133-143).
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 168, emp. added.
- <sup>35</sup> And derivatives thereof, e.g., similarity, homologous, and comparative anatomist(s).
- <sup>36</sup> For more information on homology, see Jerry Bergman (2001), "Does Homology Provide Evidence of Evolutionary Naturalism?" *Journal of Creation*, 15[1]:26-33, April 1, <https://answersingenesis.org/theory-of-evolution/evidence/does-homology-provide-evidence-of-evolutionary-naturalism/>.
- <sup>37</sup> Or derivatives thereof.
- <sup>38</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, pp. 201-280.
- <sup>39</sup> Stephen Jay Gould (2000), "Abscheulich! (Atrocious!)," *Natural History*, 109[2]:43.
- <sup>40</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 273.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 235, emp. added.
- <sup>42</sup> Sir Arthur Keith (1912), *The Human Body* (London: Williams and Norgate), pp. 94-95, emp. added.
- <sup>43</sup> Gould, pp. 44,45, emp. added.
- <sup>44</sup> For more information on embryonic recapitulation, see Trevor Major (1994), "Haeckel: The Legacy of a Lie," <https://apologeticspress.org/haeckel-the-legacy-of-a-lie-596/>. See also Elizabeth Mitchell (2020), "Recapitulation Theory: How Embryology Does Not Prove Evolution," September 5, <https://answersingenesis.org/theory-of-evolution/recapitulation-does-embryology-prove-evolution/>.
- <sup>45</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, pp. 267-268. Vestigial structures were also discussed in other parts of the written affidavits.
- <sup>46</sup> The number of vestigial organs in the human body that Wiedersheim claimed was actually 86, not 180, as asserted in the Scopes Trial—Robert Wiedersheim, (1895), *The Structure of Man: An Index to His Past History*, trans. H. and M. Bernard (London: Macmillan).
- <sup>47</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 268, emp. added.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid., pp. 246-247, emp. added.
- <sup>49</sup> "The Last Word" (2003), *New Scientist*, 177[2381]:65, February 8. See also Warwick Glover (1988), "The Human Vermiform Appendix: A General Surgeon's Reflections," *Journal of Creation*, 3[1]:34-35.
- <sup>50</sup> Duke surgery professor Bill Parker, as quoted in Seth Borenstein (2007), "Scientists: Appendix Protects Good Germs," [www.oklahoman.com/story/news/2007/10/06/scientists-appendix-protects-good-germs/61698570007/](http://www.oklahoman.com/story/news/2007/10/06/scientists-appendix-protects-good-germs/61698570007/).
- <sup>51</sup> Midwestern University (2017), "Appendix May Have Important Function, New Research Suggests," *ScienceDaily*, January 9, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/01/170109162333.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/01/170109162333.htm).
- <sup>52</sup> "Coccyx" (2018), *Healthline*, [www.healthline.com/health/coccyx#1](http://www.healthline.com/health/coccyx#1).
- <sup>53</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 280, emp. added.
- <sup>54</sup> For more information, see R.L. Wysong (1976), *The Creation-Evolution Controversy* (East Lansing, MI: Inquiry Press), pp. 397-399.
- <sup>55</sup> If macroevolution is true (i.e., large-scale changes of one kind of creature into another, which requires new genetic information), shouldn't human bodies be producing new, never-before-seen organs? (Which is not happening!)
- <sup>56</sup> Not really proving what they claim to prove—that humans evolved from ape-like creatures.
- <sup>57</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 278.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 237.
- <sup>59</sup> Jeff Miller (2023), "Does the Evidence REALLY Support Human Evolution? (Part 1)," *Reason & Revelation*, 43[8]:88, August, <https://apologeticspress.org/does-the-evidence-really-support-human-evolution-part-i/>.
- <sup>60</sup> For more information, see Miller (2023), 43[8]:86-89,92-93.
- <sup>61</sup> Hunter (1914), *A Civic Biology*, pp. 195-196.
- <sup>62</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 215.
- <sup>63</sup> Perhaps the defense knew earlier (or all along) that they wanted to try to get Bryan on the stand, but to Bryan it was a total surprise. Bryan testified during the questioning, saying, "I didn't know I was to be called as a witness" (Ibid., p. 293).
- <sup>64</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, p. 284.
- <sup>65</sup> As they let their objections be known several times before and during the questioning (Ibid., pp. 284,286,288,292,299).
- <sup>66</sup> Bryan responded to the request that he take the stand by saying, "If your honor please, I insist that Mr. Darrow can be put on the stand, and Mr. Malone and Mr. Hays." Judge Raulston replied: "Call anybody you desire. Ask them any questions you wish." To which Bryan said: "Then, we will call all three of them" (p. 284). At one point during the questioning of Bryan, he said to Darrow: "You testify to that *when you get on the stand*, I will give you a chance" (p. 287). Again, the judge was expecting Bryan to have an opportunity to question Darrow, saying, "He [Bryan] wants to ask the other gentleman [Darrow] questions along the same line" (p. 288). When Bryan was on the stand, even Darrow once implied that he [Darrow] would take the stand, too, saying, "Wait until you get to me" (Ibid., p. 293, emp. added).
- <sup>67</sup> Bryan never got an opportunity to question Darrow (or deliver his closing statement) because following the questioning of Bryan, the seventh day's proceedings ended. When the trial resumed on day eight, Darrow abruptly threw in the towel, saying, "I think to save time we will ask the court to bring in the jury and instruct the jury to find the defendant guilty" (Ibid., p. 306).
- <sup>68</sup> Joshua 10:12-14.
- <sup>69</sup> And the evidence indicates He does. See Eric Lyons and Kyle Butt (2014), "7 Reasons to Believe in God," *Reason & Revelation*, 34[10]:110-119, <https://apologeticspress.org/7-reasons-to-believe-in-god-5045/>. See also AP's book *Does God Exist?* ([www.apologeticspress.org/store/Product.aspx?pid=874](http://www.apologeticspress.org/store/Product.aspx?pid=874)), as well as the "Existence of God" section of the AP website (<https://apologeticspress.org/category/existence-of-god/>).
- <sup>70</sup> Cf. 1 Corinthians 11:8-12; 1 Timothy 2:13.
- <sup>71</sup> Keep in mind that "the Father of lights" (James 1:17), Who is "light" (1 John 1:5), could create light easily without first having to create the Sun, Moon, and stars. Just as God could produce a fruit-bearing tree on Day 3 without seed, He could produce light supernaturally on Day 1 without the "usual" light bearers (which subsequently were created on Day 4). For more information, see Eric Lyons (2006), "When Were the Sun, Moon, and Stars Created?" [apologeticspress.org/when-were-the-sun-moon-and-stars-created-1990/](http://apologeticspress.org/when-were-the-sun-moon-and-stars-created-1990/).
- <sup>72</sup> For more information, see Jeff Miller (2014), "There's No Such Thing as a Naturalist," Apologetics Press, [apologeticspress.org/theres-no-such-thing-as-a-naturalist-5050/](http://apologeticspress.org/theres-no-such-thing-as-a-naturalist-5050/).
- <sup>73</sup> Admittedly, many who wear the name "Christian" do not reason or act like Christ (e.g., John 10:37-38) nor seem to care about speaking words of "truth and reason" (Acts 26:25).
- <sup>74</sup> See Eric Lyons (2012), "Was Jonah Swallowed by a Fish or a Whale?" [www.apologeticspress.org/was-jonah-swallowed-by-a-fish-or-a-whale-2830/](http://www.apologeticspress.org/was-jonah-swallowed-by-a-fish-or-a-whale-2830/). See also Dave Miller (2003), "Jonah and the 'Whale'?" [apologeticspress.org/jonah-and-the-whale-69/](http://apologeticspress.org/jonah-and-the-whale-69/).
- <sup>75</sup> For more information, see Jeff Miller (2012), "The Law of Biogenesis—Parts 1-2," *Reason & Revelation*, 32[1-2]:2-11,14-17,20-22, January & February, [apologeticspress.org/the-law-of-biogenesis-part-i-4165/](http://apologeticspress.org/the-law-of-biogenesis-part-i-4165/); [apologeticspress.org/the-law-of-biogenesis-part-ii-4178/](http://apologeticspress.org/the-law-of-biogenesis-part-ii-4178/).
- <sup>76</sup> For more information, see Jeff Miller (2024), "Four Reasons to Believe Evolution Is Not True," *Reason & Revelation*, 44[8]:2-5,8-11, August, [apologeticspress.org/4-reasons-to-believe-evolution-is-not-true/](http://apologeticspress.org/4-reasons-to-believe-evolution-is-not-true/).
- <sup>77</sup> For evidence of the inspiration of the Bible, see Kyle Butt (2022), *Is the Bible God's Word?* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press). See also Dave Miller (2020), *The Bible Is From God: A Sampling of Proofs* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press) and "The Inspiration of the Bible" section of [www.apologeticspress.org](http://www.apologeticspress.org).
- <sup>78</sup> In one memorable scene near the end of *Inherit the Wind*, Darrow's character asks Bryan's character to imagine if the tables were turned and someone like Scopes' character had "the influence and the lung power to railroad through the state legislature a law *saying that only Darwin could be taught in the schools?*" Oh, how the tables have turned!
- <sup>79</sup> Scopes Trial Transcript, pp. 225-226.
- <sup>80</sup> Darrow was not interested in truth or in helping the world learn the truth through a fair investigation. He simply wanted to try to make fun of Bryan (and Christians who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture and a literal creation of Adam and Eve, etc.). Furthermore, Darrow "fought dirty" and strategically (and dishonestly) worked things out (by abruptly throwing in the towel on the next day and asking the court to find his client [Scopes] guilty) so that Darrow never had to take the stand himself (against Bryan)—and thus the questioning of Bryan was entirely one-sided.
- <sup>81</sup> William Jennings Bryan (1925), *The Last Message of William Jennings Bryan*, <https://archive.org/details/cain-2009-william-jennings-bryan-last-message-9781906267162/mode/2up>.



## NOTE FROM *The Editor*



### AP Staff Spotlight: Dr. Kyle Butt, Associate Director of Apologetics Press

Dr. Kyle Butt (or, as he prefers to be called—just “Kyle” or “KB”) is the longest-tenured staff member in the history of Apologetics Press. (When people think of AP, they often think of KB.) Kyle is in his 26<sup>th</sup> year with AP and has been a great blessing to many people over the past quarter-century.

Most people know Kyle as a capable debater and defender of New Testament Christianity (having had four moderated debates with some of the leading atheists in the U.S.). Many also know Kyle from reading one or more of the 40 books he has authored/co-authored or from watching some of his many faith-building videos, all of which we highly recommend.

Kyle has a unique ability to communicate God’s Truth and the love of Jesus to people of all ages. One moment, he may be discussing a difficult Bible passage with a skeptic, and the next moment, editing *Discovery*, our children’s magazine—a role he has fulfilled with distinction for the past 25 years. Just a month after successfully defending his doctoral dissertation and earning his Doctor of Minis-

try (D.Min.) from Freed-Hardeman University, he was teaching teens at AP Camp (...as well as leading the youngest campers in a challenging game of “Simon Says”). Like the apostle Paul, Kyle’s attitude is: “I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some” (1 Corinthians 9:22).

Kyle is a selfless, visionary leader who passionately seeks to bring out the best in everyone around him. I would like you to join me in congratulating Dr. Kyle Butt on his recent, well-deserved promotion to Associate Director of Apologetics Press.

In the past, Kyle and I have worked closely together in the Bible Department of AP. If the Lord wills, we will be collaborating even more in the future as we help move AP forward to the glory of God—providing logical answers and biblically sound materials in digital and printed formats to precious souls around the world.

**Eric Lyons**  
Executive Director

